

Christian Education

Vol. VIII

DECEMBER, 1924

No. 3

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*
111 Fifth Avenue
New York

O. D. FOSTER
Associate Editor

B. WARREN BROWN
Associate Editor

*Published Monthly, Omitting
July, August and September
by The Council of Church
Boards of Education in the
United States of America*

October, 1924
to June, 1925

Entered as second-class matter October 24, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.00 per annum; ten or more subscriptions 75 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies 15 cents each.

Order of Contents

	PAGE
Christian Education Week in Chicago.....	59
The Meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, 1924	60
The Meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, 1923— <i>Ralph K. Hickok</i>	60
The Meeting of the Mid-West Section of the National Association, 1924— <i>J. F. Balzer</i>	61
The Meeting of the Southern Section of the National Association, 1924— <i>John Knox</i>	62
<i>The Proceedings of the National Association</i>	64
The President's Address, <i>Charles Foster Kent</i>	64
The Biblical Teacher and Liberalism, <i>B. W. Bacon</i>	66
The Biblical Teacher's Scholarly Responsibilities, <i>Henry T. Fowler</i>	68
The Academic Obligation of the Bible Teacher, <i>Irving F. Wood</i>	76
Teaching the Bible from the Literary Angle, <i>James Muilenburg</i>	82
The Biblical Teacher as Creator of Religious Harmony, <i>Mary Redington Ely</i>	87
The Biblical Teacher and Biblical Facts, <i>J. Gresham Machen</i>	98
Recent Lives of Christ, <i>Elbert Russell</i>	107
Here and There.....	111
Transportation Announcement	113

Christian Education

Vol. VIII DECEMBER, 1924 No. 3

Christian Education Week in Chicago

THE fourteenth annual meeting of the Council of Church Boards of Education and allied agencies will be held in Chicago the week of January 5-10, 1925. The Council will meet at the Chicago Beach Hotel, beginning Monday, January 5, at 10:00 A. M., and continuing through the day and evening, Tuesday, January 6. The denominational college associations and the Conference of Church Workers in Universities will meet on Wednesday and until noon Thursday. On the afternoon of Thursday, January 8, there will be a mass meeting of all the cooperating agencies at the Hotel Morrison, as last year, under the auspices of the Council of Church Boards of Education. At this meeting the contribution of the college, the university and the theological seminary to Christian education will be presented by outstanding leaders of American education.

The Association of American Colleges will hold its annual dinner at the Morrison Hotel, Thursday evening, January 8, and will continue in session at that hotel until noon of Saturday, January 10.

The railroads in all parts of the country have agreed to grant the usual convention privilege of one and one-half fare for the round trip to delegates and members of their families in Chicago for the Annual Meeting of the Association, provided 250 tickets are sold on this basis. It is hoped that a large number of faculty members and college alumni will take advantage of this offer. Please turn to page 113.

*Conference of the National Association of
Biblical Instructors*

PROFESSOR RALPH K. HICKOK, Wells College, Recording Secretary.

THE annual gathering of the Biblical Instructors was held in Earl Hall, Columbia University, December 26 and 27, 1923. The new and exceedingly attractive Faculty Club provided a convenient place for the sessions which were held about the dinner table. The number present was possibly somewhat larger than in previous years. There was a general feeling that the program was of high order and the discussions unusually profitable. The principal papers are presented in this issue of *Christian Education*.

It is unfortunate that it is not possible to reproduce the substance of the informal discussions as these were often most helpful and vital. It is also to be regretted that the paper by Professor Ismar J. Peritz of Syracuse upon "The Religion of Pentecost in Modern Equivalent" was crowded out because of lack of time.

Professor Charles F. Kent of Yale, who has been the President of the Association from the beginning, presided at all the sessions.

At the dinner Wednesday evening Professor Charles B. Chapin of Chicora College for Women reported upon the movement of which he has been the guiding spirit, to organize a southern branch of the National Association. The report was heard with a great deal of interest and the Corresponding Secretary was instructed to write the new branch, extending our congratulations and hopes for increasing success and usefulness in its field. (A report of the first meeting by the chairman is published elsewhere in this issue.)

Informal remarks were made at the dinner by Prof. Quimby of Ohio Wesleyan University, Miss Weisel of the Presbyterian Training School, Baltimore, Prof. Edwin H. Kellogg of Skidmore College, Prof. Carpenter of the University of South Carolina, Prof. Mary Redington Ely of Vassar, Prof. Purington of Bates and Prof. Kendrick of Wellesley.

The nominating committee reported through its chairman, Professor George Dahl of Yale, as follows:

President: Professor Charles F. Kent of Yale University.
Recording Secretary: Professor Ralph K. Hickok of Wells College

Corresponding Secretary: Professor Mary Redington Ely of Vassar College

Treasurer: Miss M. L. Strayer of Dobbs Ferry School.

Program Committee: Professor E. W. K. Mould of Elmira College, Professor Purington of Bates College, Professor Robert Seneca Smith of Smith College.

These officers were duly elected.

The Mid-West Section

DR. J. F. BALZER, Carleton College

THE meetings of the Association were held in the Common Room of the New Dormitory of the Chicago Theological Seminary. The first session was opened under the leadership of Professor Wallace N. Stearns, Illinois Woman's College. Professor R. B. Stevens, Grand Island College, was appointed temporary secretary. Dr. Rupp led in prayer.

Professor Stearns made two offerings: "A Proposed Course of Bible Study" and "The Teaching of Biblical Geography." Professor J. F. Balzer read a paper entitled "Teaching the Bible to Freshmen," in which were incorporated the results of some investigations among 100 colleges. Next was read a paper by Professor Pliny J. Allen, Jr., Lombard College, "Some Aims and Limitations of Biblical Instructors in the Small College." This was followed by a discussion participated in by Professor Merrifield, University of Chicago, who called attention to the fact that biblical studies help very much in readjustment to college atmosphere.

The next paper was read by Miss Mary A. Rolfe, Urbana, Ill., "Teaching God to Students of Science." Professor F. B. Oxtoby presented a paper on "The Best Books of the Year,"

which was followed by discussion and contributions. The final number on the afternoon program was an address by Professor H. L. Willett on "The Message of the Classroom."

The meeting on the following day was opened by the reading of a paper entitled "A College Course in the Life of Jesus," prepared by Professor Walter G. Bundy, read by the presiding officer. A discussion followed. Professor J. P. Deane, Beloit College, had sent in a paper on "One-Hour Courses in the Bible," which was read by Professor William V. Roosa, of the Disciples Foundation, University of Illinois. Next followed a paper by Professor Chauncey E. Baldwin, University of Illinois, on the subject "Teaching the Bible as English."

This finished the program with the exception of a round-table discussion invited by the officers for the coming year on the subject of next year's program. There was a desire expressed by a number of those present that in some way this Association might become instrumental in mediating an exchange of course syllabi and outlines. There was also considerable interest shown in the further discussion of the problem of the freshman and our responsibilities toward him.

Officers 1924-5: President, J. F. Balzer; Vice-President, R. B. Stevens; Secretary-Treasurer, Pliny J. Allen, Jr.

The Southern Section

DR. JOHN KNOX, Emory University

IN Memphis, December 1, 1923, the Southern Section of the National Association of Biblical Instructors was organized. Thirty-four colleges representing six denominations were voted in as charter members. Arrangements were then made for the first regular meeting to take place at some time in the summer of 1924. That meeting was held at Blue Ridge, N. C., on July 15 and 16.

Professor Chapin of Chicora College for Women, temporary chairman, called the Association to order on the evening of July 15, and made a very lucid and inspiring address upon the subject: "The Aims and Objects of the Association."

On July 16 the permanent organization of the Association

was completed. Professor C. B. Chapin was elected president; Professor Edward G. Mackay, of Birmingham-Southern College, vice-president; and Assistant Professor John Knox, of Emory University, secretary-treasurer. A Program Committee was appointed composed of the President, the Secretary, and Professor F. L. Day of Randolph-Macon College, and a Committee on Standardization of which Professors F. L. Day, D. J. Brimm, of the Presbyterian College of South Carolina, and K. J. Foreman, of Davidson College, are members. Professor Day, the chairman of the Committee on Constitution, presented a tentative draft, which with but few alterations was adopted as the fundamental law of the Association.

The organization was effected with genuine enthusiasm, and plans are being made to enlist the active cooperation of every institution teaching Bible in the South. Already encouraging progress has been made. Twenty colleges have been represented in our sessions and fifteen others have signified their sympathy with the aims of the Association and their desire to be enrolled.

Professor J. L. Kessler, of Vanderbilt University, presented an excellent paper upon the subject: "How shall Biblical Literature be Taught in a General Course in what is Called a Liberal Education?" Upon motion it was enthusiastically decided to publish the address in pamphlet form and send it to every Department of Bible in the South as the first bulletin issued by the Association.

Professor Elizabeth Czarnomska, of Sweet Briar College, presented a very clear synopsis of her book soon to appear, "The Authentic Literature of the Old Testament."

At the afternoon session Professor Knox read a paper on "The Bible and the Freshman." The round-table discussion of the subject of this address concluded the program.

Large plans are being made for next summer's meeting. The Program Committee is already at work and the Secretary is in earnest and persistent correspondence with all of our Southern Departments of Biblical Literature with a view to enlisting the cooperation of all of them.

The Proceedings of the National Association

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

PROFESSOR KENT in his opening address before the National Association discussed "The Place of the Bible in Modern Education."

He analyzed its intrinsic value as a part of the world's greatest literature, its imprint through the King James Version upon the English language, and its profound influence on the great literature of all Christian races.

Significant, indeed, is the rising tide of interest among students, as well as departments of English, in the Bible as literature. It presents a challenge and opportunity which we must meet. It means that the future undergraduate teachers of the Bible must have a far more thorough training in English Literature, especially in comparative literature, than the majority of us have had.

The importance of the historical field which the Bible represents has not been fully estimated and recognized in the curricula of a majority of our American colleges. Nowhere can we trace more clearly the interworking of the political, social, moral, and religious forces and laws which determine the strength and health of a nation than in the history of the Hebrew Commonwealth. No chapter in human history is more thrilling and more important than that recorded in the New Testament. Under the present system a majority of our American youth graduate from college without any intelligent, systematic appreciation of it.

The personal and social ethics of the Hebrew prophets and Jesus have inspired that which is best in our modern civilization, and yet the average student has only a hazy idea of what these great pioneers of human thought and experimentation taught. Above all the Bible records the way in which hundreds of typical men and women were able to master their baser impulses and to find joy and success as humble servants of the living God.

In these days when there is a rising tide of interest in real religion and men everywhere are beginning to feel a conscious

or unconscious craving for harmony and cooperation with the Infinite, the Bible, which records hundreds of successful laboratory experiments in finding God, suddenly gains a new significance.

All these facts do not mean that the teacher of the Bible is to become a preacher or exhorter. His task is vividly to present and clearly to interpret the Biblical data. In his own life he must be a laboratory illustration of what he teaches.

There are adverse currents, too, with which we must reckon. The religion of materialism is aggressive, inside as well as outside our colleges. In certain of our largest universities the champions of religion are fighting with their backs to the wall.

We have reached a period when to do our task and to give the Bible the place it merits in the modern college curriculum, we must begin to train a new type of teacher. Broadly speaking, his training must be cultural rather than vocational or technical. This conclusion means that the vocational training of the theological seminary does not meet the new demand, even though it may prove in many cases a valuable foundation on which to build. Nor will the severe discipline and research work of the graduate school entirely suffice, even though they supply the indispensable drill and the opportunity to acquire the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which is recognized as fundamental in university circles.

The technical training of the future teacher of Biblical Literature in our American colleges must rest squarely on four corner-stones. The first is a thorough mastery of the languages of the Bible. The second is rigorous historical training, covering the field of history contemporary with the events recorded in the Bible. The third is an intimate knowledge of the life, customs and social atmosphere, which are the background of the Bible. To acquire this, a half year or year of residence in Palestine is most desirable. The fourth corner-stone is a thorough acquaintance with the field and methods of English literature.

If to these preparatory studies are added broad culture,

a clear knowledge of the moral and religious problems of undergraduates, marked teaching ability, and a personality irresistible to undergraduates, the place of the Bible in the curriculum of our American colleges will be assured. To find such men and to train them as indicated, a fellowship fund yielding twenty thousand dollars a year, has been placed at the disposal of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. Twenty-six National Fellows in Religion are already in training.

Undoubtedly the largest contribution that we of this generation can make to the educational needs of America is to find and inspire the men and women who will carry on, far more effectively than we, the work that we have initiated.

The Biblical Teacher and Liberalism

PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, Yale University

Note: One of the high points in the conference was the address by Professor Bacon upon the theme as given above. Unfortunately, from our point of view, the speaker had stated, when accepting the invitation to speak, that he would have no formal paper. He was later asked to reproduce an outline of his address for this magazine but declined on the grounds that he could not do so, since he had spoken so informally, and that even if it were possible, he would not have the time. With a great deal of diffidence the following inadequate outline of his message is presented by the Secretary.

* * * * *

Passing in review some of the views as to the apostle Paul, that he was a theologian with a polemic spirit, etc., the point was made that Paul should be regarded as an apostle of love, peace and unity. He really laid down his life for such things. Even Galatians is filled with these conceptions. There is, of course, the fight for liberty. But these are there as well. So also at Corinth. Much there was a scandal—the moral evils, the denial of Paul's authority. But his chief and first idea in addressing the Corinthians was to protest against the lack of

unity. There were many gifts of the spirit; the chief gift was love. Or take his later epistles; those of the captivity. The Philippian letter reveals a quarrel of some sort between Euodia and Syntyche. The cure? Be of the same mind! Or take the climax in what is, perhaps, the greatest of Paul's epistles, Ephesians—"giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."

John the Apostle (according to tradition), whatever John he may have been, at least John of Ephesus, baptized of the Spirit, became a new man, Paul's successor in Ephesus. It is said to be one of the most difficult tasks of Biblical teachers to convey the message of the Johannine literature (the gospel and the three epistles). It is a task rich in proportion to its difficulty. The man who took over Paul's work had great difficulties to face. Wolves had come in. And next to Paul, he may be called the apostle of love and peace. He had his intervals of thunder. But his chief interest is that the spiritual Christ may be known. This is the cure for all problems.

What were the difficulties in the churches of that day?

(1) The Virgin Birth. Few will agree with Garvie that John had not read the Synoptics. He certainly had. People in Ephesus were not ignorant of the differences in the early church as to this question. They surely believed in the Incarnation. As between the Adoptionists and the upholders of the Virgin Birth they would give no clear definition. The essential thing was unity.

(2) Atonement. There had been much dispute among the rabbis as between different theories. So also in Paul's time. And so it must have been in Ephesus. How was it treated by John? Christ, the propitiation for our sins and for the whole world.

(3) Eschatology. Some denied the physical resurrection. A great issue in the church. So also the judgment day and the visible second return. It was not easy to set aside such

views, nor the apocalyptic chapters in the Synoptics. Yet he does so in the 14th chapter by spiritualizing these ideas. The ancients knew very well that it was a spiritualizing gospel. Its author refused to know Christ after the flesh; knew him after the Spirit. It is not strange, therefore, that there was a fight against the Johannine writings. Nor that, when accepted, they brought in the spirit of peace.

We, if we are wise, will seek to apply such principles to the problems of our own timè. The general situation, now and then, is very much the same. This too is a critical age. The great issue is not whether one party shall prevail or another. It is not even the issue of liberty. The great need is to bring in the unity of the Spirit—the spirit of Paul and of John.

The Biblical Teacher's Scholarly Responsibilities

PROFESSOR HENRY T. FOWLER, Brown University

I HESITATE to approach the discussion of my topic without first saying the General Confession: "We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done."

Some years ago I made a more specific confession to my very considerate Father Confessor, my President. I told him that I had never devoted much time to regretting a misspent youth, but that I was beginning to regret a misspent middle-life. We were discussing Faculty administrative work, and I was suggesting that the large majority of committee members should be men under forty-five. I was then past that age. One of the things which I have often done to the exclusion of the things I ought to have done, I confess it now to you my colleagues, is Faculty administrative work. And I confess it because I want you to know that I am not here to tell you of your scholarly duty as one who has in any sense fulfilled his obligations in the sphere of such responsibilities.

The Biblical teacher's responsibilities—Who is the Biblical teacher? There are several groups of us in America who may claim that title:

1. Those whose teaching is a direct function of the Church, in Sunday School or Association Bible classes, or in the Pulpit.
2. Those who are giving Biblical instruction in professional schools for the preparation of clergymen and other religious workers.
3. A group of great significance, though small numerically—Those University teachers who give a measurable amount of Biblical instruction to graduate students.
4. Those chiefly represented in this conference—Biblical instructors in undergraduate colleges and secondary schools.

The scholarly responsibilities of the third group need no discussion. They are obvious and are generally met in full measure. As to the first and second groups, those more closely related to the distinctively religious institutions, this is not the time and place for specific discussion of their responsibilities, though we may be obliged to touch upon them in defining our own field.

Some seventeen years ago I published in *The Outlook* an article on "The New Place of the Bible in the American College." I did not speak of the secondary school—at that time the Bible had not found very much of a new place in the school. If there at all, it was generally on the old basis which made little discrimination between academic and church instruction in the Bible. In that *Outlook* article, I sketched somewhat the transition from the earliest days when every Harvard student was required to study the Hebrew Bible and from the early nineteenth century when the sole Greek requirement for admission was Jacob's "Reader" and the Gospels, and tried to show how natural was the crowding of the Bible out of the American college curriculum in the middle and latter half of the nineteenth century.

It was my fortune in my Junior year to be a member of the first class that participated in the return of the Bible to the

college curriculum on a new basis. That was thirty-five years ago. Alas, the new basis has not always been clearly differentiated from the old, that old basis which eventuated in the elimination of Biblical studies from the curriculum. Nor is the new basis always clearly distinguished from that of the church's Biblical instruction.

One of our scholarly responsibilities is, it seems to me, to keep that differentiation clear word and deed, especially deed. I realize that our college education is a one-sided affair, making no adequate provision for aesthetic and religious development. It is an exceedingly difficult matter, however, to give curriculum courses calculated to afford aesthetic or religious culture, which do not serve to undermine the moral integrity of the institution. It is very easy for college courses in art, music, religion, even courses in the aesthetic appreciation of literature, to become centres for the undermining of college morale. Where the main effort is to cultivate loving appreciation of the beautiful or the good, academic courses are often made so light in their work-requirements that they become gathering places for the lazy and indifferent, centres of relaxation of basic college morality. In speaking thus, I am of course counting responsibility to do the day's work as basic morality. Such courses not only tend to become general centres of corruption of institutional life—they often defeat their own ends, bringing art and religion into contempt as subjects unworthy of serious consideration.

Our responsibility is first, to see to it that our courses are of a character to call for an amount of work every week, at least up to the average of courses in Mathematics, Science, History, Economics, Literature, and the rest. As academic teachers, it is not our primary responsibility to win our students to acceptance of the religion of the Bible as their personal religion, but it is our duty to see to it that they do such intelligent study that they come to understand the Bible in the light of present-day scholarship, or else to understand that they have failed and are entitled to no credit for the course. As a matter of fact, attested by experience, we thus render our most fundamental and far reaching religious service.

Another phase of our duty in this matter of differentiating our work from that belonging specifically to the church and Christian Association, is connected with the attitude toward our department often held by administrative officials and teachers in other fields. I will tell you why I wrote that article for *The Outlook* in 1907; it was in the hope of enlightening some of my Faculty associates as to the place of my department. It proved a vain hope; I do not know that any one of them ever read it. I wrote a somewhat similar article for our Alumni magazine laying stress upon the local history of Biblical study in the University and trying to show its new place in the curriculum. Possibly that reached a few Brown men.

Perhaps you see now why I say "especially in deed" rather than word. If I have been able to accomplish anything in securing a better understanding among my associates of the rightful place of a Biblical department in the institution, it has been chiefly through seeking to keep my courses up to the college standard in work-requirement and through active, personal participation in such things as our Faculty Philological Club, where we are expected to present fresh fruits of our studies.

This brings me into the heart of the question of our responsibility for personal, scholarly activity, outside of that study which has an immediate bearing upon the preparation of our courses. Here a greater obligation rests upon us than upon most of our associates in other departments. If a professor of European history or of Mathematics is content to hand down the accumulated treasures of knowledge, as far as academic students are prepared to receive those treasures, without himself making constant progress in his field of study or showing any creative spirit, he brings discredit upon himself, but he does not endanger the reputation of his subject as worthy a place in the course of study; there is no suspicion abroad that his subject is in the college or school under any false pretenses—a suspicion, or belief, which that great president, the late Dr. Hyde, was so free to express in reference to college curriculum Bible courses.

It is true, I think, that few teachers of any literature or history, whose work is chiefly in American academy or undergraduate college, are able to make real contributions to the sum of human knowledge, but every such teacher should demand of himself steady advancement in scholarship. If he is so fortunate as to have even a few graduate students who are candidates for the doctor's degree, he will find himself, in directing their investigations, drawn ever onward. If he hasn't advanced students, the impulse may have to come almost wholly from within. Those of us who are too heavily burdened with the teacher's round to find much chance for independent study should at least find time to attend the annual gatherings of one learned society; that is more vital for us, I think, than even the stimulating sessions of these conferences where we may gain so much of helpful suggestion and encouragement, but where we are not brought into direct contact with the fresh fruits of productive scholarship in our field of study. New food is more essential to the worker than stimulants or advice.

I wonder how many of the institutions represented here have adopted the practice introduced by the Brown Corporation a few years ago, of paying a part of the expenses of those who attend meetings of their learned societies. The administration of the fund appropriated for this purpose is, with us, entrusted to a Faculty committee who allot a little larger percentage of the railroad fare to those who are officers or who read papers than to those who simply attend the meetings, but attendance itself is thus much encouraged. I doubt whether five times the money expended in any other way has done so much for the scholarly upbuilding of the University. Administrations and Corporations have their opportunities for elevating scholarly standards as well as professors.

It sometimes seems to me that the prevailing forces of American life outside the college and inside are in league to prevent the academic teacher from scholarly growth. Outside and inside the college, his usefulness is commonly estimated in terms of hours of teaching and numbers of students or in service on boards and committees and in popular ad-

resses. It may be hinted, even by fellow-teachers, that the one who devotes himself at all to personal, scholarly activity is looking out for his own selfish interests rather than the welfare of the institution. Such suggestions may sometimes be justified, but the erring is more often in the other direction. It is our responsibility as academic teachers of the Bible, in the new day when the Bible has recently come back into the scheme of liberal education, to rise above the average level of our colleagues in scholarly effort and, if possible, achievement. Our kinsman the professor of Sociology has a somewhat similar responsibility.

It is not simply because of the widespread confusing of our work, on the one hand with Sunday school teaching and, on the other, with professional training of religious workers, that our department places heavy responsibilities upon us. The field of study itself, like that of the Sociologist, is so broad and varied and the methods and materials of teaching as yet so unshaped that it puts peculiar demands upon us. Here I may easily fall into the common error suggested by the popular definition of a "soft snap" as "the other fellow's job." We cannot appreciate all the difficulties of the man in the other department, but, trying to understand them as best we may, it does seem to be more difficult in our field to be worthy scholars and academic teachers than in most. We find it necessary to touch upon the history and civilization of Egypt, Babylonia, Syria, including Professor Clay's elusive kingdom of the Amurru, Phoenicia, Arabia, Persia, Greece, and Rome, and I for one cannot be a competent student of all these histories and civilizations as well as those of Israel and the early church and, at the same time, be a competent historian and interpreter of a literature written, partly in Semitic and partly in Indo-European, through a period of a thousand years.

Again the confessional: Besides giving too much time to Faculty committee work, I acknowledge that I have usually taught too many classes and subjects, properly to meet my scholarly responsibilities as a professor of Biblical Literature and History.

Thus far I have been speaking of our duties to the college or school within the institution, considered as existing to teach its regular students. But our academic institutions have recognized responsibilities to the public outside of these. Teachers seek to fulfill the extra-mural duties through writing and lecturing and through church and various public service organizations. However carefully we may make selection in our connection with outside activities and however rigidly limit ourselves in responding to the multifarious calls of our overorganized society, probably most of us academic teachers of the Bible ought to limit ourselves much more rigidly than we do. Primarily, it is the teacher's privilege and function to render multiple service through his students or to influence hundreds and thousands with his pen; he must not allow himself to be much absorbed in local, community affairs in which he can render only the service of a single unit.

I have indicated my conviction that it is impossible for most of us who are associated in this organization to be original investigators, contributing significantly to the sum-total of knowledge in our field of study. We have to cover too broad a field for much minute research, and our teaching burdens are usually too great. That we must largely leave to the specialists in the theological seminaries and the graduate schools of the great universities. Yet there are opportunities of scholarly service through publication which are peculiarly our own. I think it can be shown that the graduate teacher on the one hand and the clergyman on the other do not ordinarily know so well how to interpret the results of Biblical scholarship into terms of the thinking and interest of intelligent people generally as the college teacher knows. I used to believe that we were not in so favorable a position to render that service as the clergymen. Once I set the matter before an unusually open-minded, forward-looking group of city ministers. I told them that we of the more limited human contacts belonging to academic life could not be expected to put the results of the new Biblical knowledge into proper form for the nourishment of the people, that they were in the position to do that. I was sadly mistaken. For one reason or

another, very few clergymen as yet have shown themselves able to do much of that sort of thing. That fact indicates another opportunity and responsibility for us. Our work in the give and take of the class room with young people who have grown up in the different denominations, in parishes conservative or progressive, gives better preparation, I now believe, than the work of the pastorate for wisely interpreting the new Bible knowledge to men and women of the new day. The publication of school and college texts or of books placing before general readers the broad results of scholarship may not be as high scholarly service as the presentation of one's own original research, but it is one of the best services that most of us can hope to render.

These then, are the suggestions that I venture to offer:

1. That it is our especial responsibility to make academic Bible teaching distinctively academic; in freedom of investigation, hard work, and general scholarly interest of all concerned, fully on a par with the best departments of our institutions. To this end the Biblical professor himself must make his place among his Faculty associates as one of those most devoted to scholarly ideals and effort.

2. Our field of study itself, in its breadth and variety, puts especially heavy demands upon us for constant, scholarly advancement. If we cannot do original research, we must be in touch with those who can.

3. In fulfilling our responsibilities to the general public, we must expect to render service chiefly through the future activities of our students. The Supreme Teacher devoted the latter part of his ministry largely to the training of the Twelve. In so far as we undertake immediate service outside the academic walls, we must carefully choose that which our experience as students and teachers of the Bible best fits us to perform and reject many alluring calls, even though in doing so we may be sadly misunderstood.

In the quaint liturgy of that branch of the Reformed Church with which I was connected in youth, those who are guilty of certain sins are charged to refrain from the Table. The enumeration of sins goes on and on until it seems that every

one is to be excluded, when suddenly the word comes, "But, dearly beloved brethren, this is not designed to deject the contrite hearts of the faithful as though only those who are without sin might come." I assure you that this earnest pressing home of our scholarly responsibilities, whatever the result, has not been designed to deject the contrite hearts of the faithful.

The Academic Obligation of the Bible Teacher

PROFESSOR IRVING F. WOOD, Smith College

AT these delightful gatherings we have had papers on many subjects; not least on the obligations of our Department to the building of character and religious life in our students. This was most desirable, for not all Departments concern themselves directly with it, and it ought to be our especial field.

But what of our academic obligations? "We take them for granted," we say. "Of course all college teachers take them for granted."

Of course we do; but academic obligations need clear definition as much as do moral aims. All of us who are teachers—college and secondary—are tempted to define our academic aims in either too general or too narrow ways. Either we say that we must teach our students to think, or that we must teach them to know the facts of our special subjects. These are the academic aims of education, and they apply from the multiplication table to Vedantic Philosophy. But within and around these general aims there lie certain specific objectives which are not the same in all departments. Chemistry and Civics are not trying to do quite the same thing, nor are French and Philosophy exact duplicates in purpose. Perhaps then you will bear with me if I try to state a few of the specific purposes of the academic side of Bible teaching in both secondary and college fields.

1. Sympathetic appreciation of a civilization and its literature.

It seems to me that culture is nothing more nor less than the power of sympathy. Provincialism is inability to see things from any but one point of view. Ideally the best course of study I know to combat provincialism is Comparative Religion; but for most institutions practically the most effective course is the Bible course.

There are other subjects which invite this attitude—Sociology, History, the literature of any nation—but Biblical study compels it. This subject is something like Geology, which will always be a thing-in-a-book unless a student can be brought to visualize a Mesozoic landscape. So the Bible will be nothing but a dead book unless the student can be brought to realize how he would have felt had he been an ancient Hebrew.

May I suggest some of the more obvious portions of the Bible which demand this?

There are the old stories and legends. We all recognize that they took form as stories told in Hebrew families and by story-tellers in the villages. We shall never get the thrill of them unless we can feel as the Hebrew villager felt when he heard them told. Fancy the story of the shepherd boy, "just like one of us, the ancestor of one of our tribes," who became the viceroy in the great empire on the Nile. In dramatic quality it goes far ahead of the rail-splitter who became President. You can see the boys' eyes grow big as it was told.

Think of the story of Abraham told in a village on the hills above Hebron; how he lived "down here under that old oak," and one day he saw three men, and he said, "Come in and have dinner and stay with me." One of the men was God. "Think how great our ancestor was that God sat down and ate with him!"

Or think of the slow growth of moral ideals. If your god is a low god you need not give him your best; but if you have risen to the idea of a high God you must give him your best. You are proud of your high God. You would be ashamed to give him less than the best. Can you get the students to see—to feel—what that would mean in the ancient Orient? Can you get them to a point where they will them-

selves suggest that it means child sacrifice? If so, they can draw a conclusion not their own from a stated premise. Then the famous utterance in the Book of Micah is seen to be more than a rhetorical question: "Shall I give my first-born for my sin, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" And the negative answer will seem to them, as it probably seemed to the conservatives of his day, to be dangerously liberal, to be loosening the bonds of the faith of the fathers.

Or take that marplot Jeremiah. See how unpatriotic and irreligious he was, from the conservative religious positions of his time. The nation was in straits. The people were in danger of defeat by discouragement. What they needed was some stirring national hope, some faith that the God of their fathers would help them. There was a nationalist party which believed in doing something. Perhaps they could win their freedom. At least it was better to die fighting than to lie down like dumb beasts. But here was Jeremiah, coward, traitor, irreligious, advising them to sit still, never to raise a hand, to take Babylonia's kicks and say "Thank you." In a siege he even advised the people to desert to the enemy. And this traitor had the face to talk about trust in Jehovah! Trust indeed! Is Jehovah as cowardly as he?

You never can understand Jeremiah till you can see what a faithless coward he must have seemed to the practical religious man of his own time.

I used to feel apologetic when I asked my class to study the codes of laws. Now I apologize to my classes for giving so little time to the laws. Nothing else pictures so vividly the changes of a civilization as the shifts of its laws. Get the class to read themselves back into the kind of a civilization when Exodus 20—23 was the natural code of laws. What was property then? What of the courts? How were laws enforced? What was the relation of religion to life? How was the kindly feeling, always present in every race, shown in the laws? What kind of a civilization could have that kind of an interest in law? These are a few of the questions which raise themselves as the details of the laws are studied. What a chapter in the history of civilization is written in the chang-

ing slave laws in the different codes! How significant for the evolution of cult in religion are the developing laws of the priestly caste! Can your students think through the chain of reasoning which led the prophetic editors to propound the central Deuteronomic law, and bring all worship to Jerusalem; and then can they realize what the natural reaction of priests and people at a shrine like Gilgal or Beersheba would be to this new law?

These are a few of the more striking situations which demand the understanding of an alien civilization; for of course the first lesson in the primer of Biblical Literature is that the civilization of the Bible is not our civilization. In all cases, the appreciation of a literature waits upon the appreciation of the civilization of the people who produced it. People may talk as much as they please about the splendor of Isaiah and the grandeur of the Psalms and the logic of Paul's letters, but until they have thought themselves into the intellectual atmosphere of the writers so that they see how the thing said was the only possible thing which could be said, studying the Bible is not culture, but only intellectual gymnastics.

How does all this concern academic obligation? In this way: that he who has lived through this experience in even a small measure has acquired so much of culture. He can never afterwards be a hopeless provincial. He has seen how someone else once looked at things.

You remember Zophar the Dogmatist in the Book of Job. He has no reason for his own belief, and he cannot see how anyone can believe differently. "It's so because it's so. It doesn't have to have a reason." It is our academic business to get rid of Zophars in American life. It is not our task alone. Other Departments are working at it, too; but none of them have a better field for the work than we do.

2. Let me speak of a task more exclusively ours. It is the task of helping our students to understand the evolution of religion.

This also belongs to the field of culture. I sometimes think that most religious thinking lies between indifference and pro-

vincialism. Either people care nothing about religion, or they can conceive of no real religion except their own. Now the religion of the Bible is almost as distinct from ours as its civilization. The Bible is the best handbook of the evolution of religion which is available. It would be a training in culture if one did nothing more than to trace the growth of the idea of God, from the limited God of the early legends, who made all the animals in unsuccessful experiments to get companions for the poor, lonely creature he had put in Eden, to the all-wise God, the loving Father of Jesus Christ our Lord. I do not mean, showing our students that it is on the pages of a book—that never produced true culture. I mean helping them to think through the process, to see how satisfying each stage was to the thought of that stage, and how inevitable the next stage was when circumstances compelled thought to shift.

Or take the growth of the explanation of suffering. It began so simply in the early prophets! "Why do you suffer? Because you have sinned. Look about you and see. It is always so." Then Hebrew national life became more complex. The old theology no longer held. People began to search for a new theology, as men and nations frequently have to do. We know how Habakkuk and the Second Isaiah and the author of Job searched for answers.

Or take the evolution of the idea of a future life. In early Israel there were the old primitive conceptions of the land of the dead, found all over the world; but Jehovah was not the God of the dead, but of the living, and these old ideas became at last pinched out, till Job ignores them and the writer of Ecclesiastes argues that hoping for a life after death is utter folly. Then the ethical demand for the justice of God to suffering human souls compelled the hope of a resurrection which yet was not immortality.

These are some of the high spots of the evolution of religion, where the Bible is unique in the compactness and fullness of its presentation of religious history. I am quite willing to leave the evolution of the human race to the biologist

and geologist; but the evolution of religion is ours to maintain.

3. We can make a contribution to the ability for literary criticism. Do you say that is the business of the Departments of literature? Ours is a Department of literature. We are forced to train to nice literary discrimination. When, in the ordinary course of your teaching, your students do so simple a thing as to pick out a passage in the Hexateuch, or a section of D editing in Judges or Kings, they have exercised their power of literary criticism. They are training that power when they differentiate First from Second Isaiah, see why the end of Amos or Micah cannot be parts of the original books, perceive the distinction between the Synoptists and John, try to draw the line in Hebrew oratory between prose and verse, discuss whether Hebrews is argument or exhortation, or give attention to half a hundred other problems which naturally arise in trying to understand the Bible.

I think if, in some future incarnation, I should be set to teach the canons of literary criticism, I should want to take the Bible as the best field of study. I know no other body of literature which presents so many of the great problems of literary criticism so compactly, so clearly, and in so easy a form for study. I am confident that our students are getting valuable training in that subject.

4. Much the same thing might be said of the training in the canons of historical criticism. We are teaching our students how to use ancient sources for historical purposes—legends and traditions and ballads and war songs and scraps of history embedded in hero tales and the orations of men possessed with one idea—almost everything except what our age calls "the white light of history." I look for the days when the training in the modern methods of the study of the Bible will have a distinct issue in the study of the literature of early India and China and Persia, to mention only a few countries, as throwing light upon their early history.

5. These are all elements of that great academic purpose about which we hear so much—teaching to think.

Other departments are subject to a certain misapprehension, but I think we suffer from it more than most. People often suppose that our chief aim is to teach merely facts about the Bible. That seems to me like supposing that the chief value of Analytical Calculus is to teach logarithms. Do you ever have a student ask if it is not possible to read a book with father, who is a minister, and pass off the Bible examination? Sometimes father himself asks it; then I know that he has not the glimmer of an inkling of what college Bible study means.

We want our students to learn to think through the problems of Biblical Literature. We want them to learn for themselves to draw conclusions from premises; to see what is reasonable and what not; to think themselves into that portion of the world's life which the Bible represents. We believe we offer a part of the intellectual training for which the college exists. If we do not, we have no business to be in college. If, as we believe, we have a task of moral and religious training also, that is our privilege of educational surplus, our extra dividend. But it never absolves us from our plain, simple academic obligation to teach our students to think.

Teaching the Bible from the Literary Angle

PROFESSOR JAMES MUILENBURG, University of Nebraska

IT requires little intellectual acumen to play the role of critic-antagonist. Especially when we examine our educational system we need not study long before we discover sinister defects. Nor would any criticism, perhaps, be easier to make than that our education is not producing a rounded development of all man's powers.

It is not at all so deplorable, it seems to me, that our educational system is continuously under fire as the fact that it is not receiving enough of the right kind of "shelling." I may best illustrate what I mean, perhaps, by the famous controversy in England during the nineteenth century. Men of the calibre of J. S. Mill, J. H. Newman, Thomas Huxley,

Matthew Arnold, and Frederic Harrison concerned themselves profoundly with the problem of a sufficient training for the youth of their age. Their words are significant for us. For my part, I should view with joy the renewal of such criticism. It produces a healthy state of mind; and whatever else we may say against it, it does not produce stagnation. Moreover, it is incomparably better than a position of apathy, hopelessness, or unwillingness to make the supreme effort that any fundamental change requires.

A most interesting phase of the controversy was the dispute of Matthew Arnold with Frederic Harrison concerning the nature of culture. Matthew Arnold feared the bent of human nature "to allow one side of our activity to stand so all-important and all-sufficing that it makes other sides different." We certainly have reason to fear this same bent. We quite agree that "the following of a master concern of any kind," whether it be natural science or the classics, is inimical to a sound training. On the whole, all parties are willing to agree that we must work toward the law of harmonious development. Splendid! We shall "offer" the student a "liberal education." He will study Chemistry, Physics, and Mathematics, as well as read Homer and Vergil and Dante and Milton. He will familiarize himself with Greek culture and Roman society, with Teutonic institutions and modern democracy. Then, so seems our educational leader to say, we shall have attained the aim of a cultural education.

But there has been a constantly growing class of thinkers who feel that our education is prejudiced against a most important, even the most important, phase of human activity. It does not provide that which, in the minds of many, is most valuable. It excludes the literature of the Hebrews from its curricula. And in excluding this literature, it legislates against a portion of the human consciousness. It does not give free range to the activity of the mind. State legislatures, in regular assembly, rule the Scriptures from the educational system. But when they so rule, they are acting against the first principles of a liberal education. They are consciously legislating against the law of harmonious development.

How the Bible is to be taught in our schools and colleges, and especially in our state-endowed institutions, is of course a matter of vital concern. It is no easy problem. The intricate and complex problems of religious creed and ecclesiastical tradition, whether we like to think so or not, are really perplexing. No one approach is altogether satisfactory. We must not only tread carefully, but we must feel our way as we present the fruits of modern scholarship together with the underlying message of the literature.

The literary approach to the Bible is, I believe, not only legitimate, but is most salutary in its effects. Of course such an approach does not preclude its being taught as something more than literature, but it almost goes without saying that the literary approach, in the only true sense of the word, is more natural than the scientific. The one aims at an intelligent appreciation of the best that has been preserved from Hebrew literature; the other at intelligence and arrangement. From the point of view of the teacher of literature, the task is first of all to make the student love the literature with which he is dealing.

In the study of the Bible such a task is confessedly a most difficult one. It has been my experience that the average student is cursed with an inbred induration to the appeal of that which should be most fundamental in his life. He has taken a sort of Punic oath that he will avoid "such impossible stuff" when once he gets the chance. He thinks of endless hours of study of verses in a deathless search for an ethical idea. Of such a thing as literature he has not the remotest idea. He has never approached the Bible, of his own accord, to read from it chapter upon chapter. The first problem, then, is the removal of this deep-laid induration to the appeal of Hebrew literature.

The other problems in the study of Biblical literature are closely related. If a student has a distant notion that he is being preached to, he will have none of it. The antipathy is not altogether unwholesome. He is playing fair. He hates Wordsworth and George Eliot where they become "preachy."

An aversion to moralizing lies deep-rooted in the heart of the average American.

Not only does the student not conceive of the Bible as a great literature, but what is far worse, he conceives it as a sort of manual of an outworn morality. The emphasis upon Bible study in his youth has only served to prove to him that its teachings are far-fetched, its morality inadequate and uninspiring.

With this induration to the appeal of Biblical literature, this aversion to "preachiness," and this notion of an outworn morality, comes a misconception as difficult to describe as it is to handle. He possesses a wrong idea of the nature of religion. If he has not always interpreted it in the language of dogma, he has heard it expressed in mystical and mystifying terms, to him always incomprehensible. When he was told of the amenities of the spiritual life, he thought in terms of a ghostly something which functioned strangely within one's inner being.

Of course all students do not approach Biblical study with exactly these antipathies nor to the degree that I have suggested, but in one form or another I have observed them. How are we, as instructors in the literature of the Bible, to meet such formidable difficulties. Above all, of course, by a careful analysis of our own particular problems. I have found three or four remedies which seem to me to have gone far to the removal of these untoward conditions.

The use of parallel readings in the literature of other nations gives the student the value of perspective. One does not teach Job long, for instance, without suggesting "Prometheus Bound" or "Paracelsus" or "Manfred." Likewise, the study of the idea of immortality in Paul receives a sort of life-giving impulse when viewed in the light of Plato's "Phaedo" and much of our English poetry (Browning's "Prospice," Tennyson's "In Memoriam," Shelley's "Adonais," Stevenson's "Requiem," etc., *ad infin.*). In reading the voluptuous love lyrics of the "Song of Songs," I can not help but suggest a parallel reading of Mrs. Browning's "Sonnets from the Portuguese" or of the lyrics of Theocritus. I have often

wondered whether an interpretation of some of the great Hebrew prophets in the light of much of our nineteenth century thought might not be legitimate. For instance I can never read Isaiah's words:

Woe unto them that call evil good,
And good evil;
That put darkness for light,
And light for darkness;
That put bitter for sweet,
And sweet for bitter

without thinking of Matthew Arnold's essay on "Sweetness and Light." A study of some of Arnold's work does evince a remarkable interpretation, it seems to me, of the prophet Isaiah. Similarly, might we not do something with Jeremiah and the much-maligned Thomas Carlyle. Ruskin begins one of his most interesting essays with the query: "For what is our life: it is even as a vapor that appeareth for a time and then passeth away." For a study of Ezekiel's conception of justice as illustrated in Chapter 18, there is a splendid parallel in the third chorus of Aeschylus's "Agamemnon." It is the finest pre-Christian assertion of God's justice that we know. If the use of literary parallels has many defects, it at least has the redeeming quality of being effective in the classroom.

A second remedy is the cultivation or rather encouragement of the student to approach the Bible with a genuinely critical attitude, I should almost say "skeptical," if the word connotes what I desire. If our students are to be well-rounded men and women, if the study of the Bible is going to aid them in seeing life steadily and in seeing it whole, then we must give free play to the natural critical bent of an intelligent reader. Reading does, to be sure, need the guidance of a sympathetic instructor and a knowledge of the canons of literary criticism, but these may be gained as a study of the literature progresses. We cannot be bigots in our classroom, and we cannot hand down decisions *ex cathedra*.

A third remedy is the constant and consistent urge of the emotional value of literature. It should motivate most of our teaching, and should serve as a working hypothesis in our presentation of the subject. While the over-emphasis of the emotional phase of literary study has its insidious dangers, there is a real menace in giving the student the Bible in a purely technical and critical way. Unless we can get our students to feel, and to feel deeply, about matters of abiding worth, such as those with which we are dealing, we are in peril of losing permanently for them some of the most valuable teachings of the Scriptures.

What I have said above should make clear that the attempt is largely to set the study of the Bible in its proper perspective. Without this perspective, one runs the risk of becoming lop-sided. And the student is exceedingly sensitive to the personality of his Bible instructor. He already has him garbed sanctimoniously and eccentrically. We must therefore infuse into all our efforts all the glorious benefits of humanism, both in its historical and its broad significance. We must strive to avoid any extra-human or supra-human mode of approach. We must know our students as normal human beings who possess all the normal emotions of humanity. Our courses should be adapted not to the eccentric, hypersensitive grind, nor to the individual "fed up" on a "hot-bed" religion, but primarily to the men and women who come to us with healthy and critical minds that are none-the-less receptive to the appeals of enduring literature. We must in great measure accept for ourselves the *nihil humani* of the old Latin playwright: "I am indifferent to nothing human."

The Biblical Teacher as Creator of Religious Harmony

PROFESSOR MARY REDINGTON ELY, Vassar College

THE problem which this subject implies is both real and intense in our generation. We live in an age of great religious issues; great issues that are passionately considered; and if American religious life of this age were to be character-

ized categorically, we should be forced, no matter how reluctantly, to speak of it as predominantly divisive rather than unifying. The division between conservative and liberal in religion was never more sharply defined in our country than today; opposing positions were never more vigorously championed; and this in an age that has seemingly taken to heart the social message and that has made "co-operation" its shibboleth. To us who are primarily concerned with the educational aspects of the religious life, whose educational materials are the subject of one of the most controversial aspects of religious thinking today, the problem of religious harmony is particularly pertinent. Indeed, Mr. Bryan's recent utterance in New York lays at our door the blame for the entire situation. "It is the college teachers who are to blame," he says. "The change in these students is due to their teachers, who are undermining the faith of our boys and girls."* No dismissal of the charge as unjust and unfounded is sufficient for us. The truth of the matter is, that we are intimately and inevitably bound up with this religious crisis in this country, and we cannot, if we will, escape the responsibility which it lays upon us.

At first blush the implications of the subject which is before us seem to be so clear as to be self-evident. Religious harmony, yes—the great desideratum of our day, and the problem is merely that of the means by which the harmony can be secured. Training in tolerance in every branch of education must be advocated, and in the Biblical field especially, since its materials lie close to the heart of the controversy. Any agency that can be formative in producing tolerant attitudes is to be utilized; and to be creative in this enterprise is to give a divine gift to the age.

But closer thinking reveals that the problem is not so simple as this. Even the goal itself as stated must be called in question. What do we mean by "religious harmony"? And is harmony in this area of experience actually desirable? Is not the very nature of religion so knit up with the emotional

* N. Y. Tribune, December 9, 1923.

life of man that there can be no true dynamic if complete tolerance prevails? Is not the very fervor which produces the martyr and the creative religious thinker the fervor which will tolerate no variableness nor shadow that is cast by turning from its own view? Is harmony compatible with conviction? Or dynamic with forbearance? It may be dismissed without argument, as the merest axiom of experience, that uniformity, conformity to a fixed type, is neither possible nor desirable. There could be no argument for it on either theoretical or practical grounds. Nor is our present status of affairs defensible. No one who has the interests of Christianity at heart can be content to see the religious life of America described through the symbols of a military enterprise, as today it is universally described. The familiar terminology greets us from every discussion of America's religious life:

"The battle is drawn"

"the forces of conservatism arrayed against the forces of liberalism"

"the attack of one clergyman upon another"

"the weapons of one vs. the weapons of another"

"the camp," "the defense," "the enemy," "the victory."

These are the figures of speech which we meet in every periodical and newspaper today as it describes the attitudes and the practices that constitute American Christianity. An editorial in the New York World for December 5th of this current year describes one group taking part in the controversy then being waged in this city as follows:

"When they come to deal with the disagreement on an article of doctrine, they are filled with bitterness, and eaten with hate. Not one note of the humility of Jesus is found in the speeches of these men. Not one note of charity. Not one note of forgiveness. Not one note of gentleness. But instead, curses and pugnacity, fire and brimstone, and all uncharitableness. It is amazing how little of the spirit of the Gospels prevailed in this savage anger."

When such a comment can come from the secular press upon any group whatsoever who stand for the interests of

religion in the community, it is time for all of us, whether conservative or liberal, to pause and ask ourselves what is the way out from so deplorable a situation as this. Such things must not be.

But, on the other hand, there is a tolerance which is unworthy of being our goal—a tolerance which amounts to indifference because passion has passed from it, and conviction has all but ceased. The tolerance which is merely a diffuse benevolence, without standards for intellectual or moral achievement, without concern for the welfare or opinion of others, is meaningless and empty of value. If liberality goes to the extreme of dropping all concern on the part of the one for the views and the conduct of the other, if its policy to "live and let live" is the result of a languid indifference, then this latter state is no better than the former. It is not merely peace without victory, it is peace without significance, and there is no health in it. For us in this age of challenge from pulpit to pulpit, of heresy trials and threats of unfrocking, there seems little danger of erring on this side. In any case it is well to glimpse the possibility lest we fail to state with clarity the goal toward which we wish to set our face.

What is, then, the religious harmony which is worth the having, and worth working for? It is a harmony that is neither uniformity on the one hand, nor on the other, a spineless indulgence which concedes merely because it has nothing too dear to give up. Any formulation of our goal must recognize fairly that religion if it is anything at all is the dearest possession of life. It holds before man for his intellectual consideration the sublimest truths of all experience: no problems within the scope of man's intellectual grasp cut so deep into life as the problems about God; the nature and destiny of the human soul; duty, immortality, sin, and salvation. If these themes are to be thought upon at all they must be thought upon with passionate intensity, and with consecrated intelligence.

Let us face also the fact, that not only the attitudes but the activities that religion asks of man are those which involve a commitment to them of his whole self. There is no half-

hearted way to live the Christian life. The deepest dedication of which man is capable controls the activities that express his religious life—prayer—worship, the eager concern for the welfare of others that makes up the great social enterprise that we call the Kingdom or the democracy of God—these are activities which if they are engaged in at all must be engaged in with a completely dedicated life. It is no dispassionate mood in which man can contemplate and act upon Jesus' words, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me." In both belief and conduct, the values of religion lie so close to life itself that they cannot be divested of a life-and-death significance, and a vitality that brooks no minimization. If I take Dr. Fosdick's words and plead for a Christianity that is "intellectually hospitable, tolerant, liberty-loving,"* I must do it with the realization that tolerance must not lose from itself one whit of the exhilaration and the intensity which is inherent in the very nature of religion itself. The religious harmony that is desirable is like that of the art from which the figure comes. A single pure tone is peaceful but it does not exhibit harmony and it lacks the richness of the chord. Harmony is possible only when, with the presence of many voices, the chance for discord exists. It represents variety and richness of tone but without confusion, difference without clashing, and warmth and color without dissonance. If we carry the figure into the present situation, our religious harmony must come as a resolving chord after a hideous discord, but so may it come, without the loss of one voice, or of the richness of tone, or fervor of spirit, that that one voice can give.

With this much of definition of our goal as suggested by the subject before us for discussion, we may turn to the specific question of the means through which the Biblical teacher may work creatively toward the achievement of that goal. In the large it is undeniable that any historical study builds patience to a certain extent. The long look at life is the gentle

* Sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" First Presbyterian Church, New York, May 21, 1923.

one, and we learn through the long look back patience for the long look ahead. Any consideration of comparative religion tends to build an attitude of tolerance if rightly handled. But in a peculiar sense the materials in the Biblical field are fertile soil for the producing of just such a plant as we have described. The Biblical teacher deals with a literature rich in variety of expression and yet wrought out of a fundamental unity of purpose. He handles as the common tool for his task a laboratory note-book of religious experience which has been the greatest treasure-house of the race for generations of men. He has in his hands the possibility of treatment of his material, either to make it the center of controversy or to make it the means for the development of the true harmony which we have just defined. There are many angles from which we might view the teaching problem involved in this situation, but I ask your consideration merely of three fundamental attitudes which I hold to be of controlling force in the building of religious harmony.

First, the fundamental proposition upon which all Biblical study should rest is that there are inherent differences in temperament and personality which appear and should appear in the religious life of mankind. Not only is uniformity of belief and practice impossible but it is undesirable as well. Even in the life of the individual there is on a small scale this same demand for variety, because of diversity in mood or because of changing conditions of health and circumstances. The Biblical material is rich in illustration of this point. The law-giver; the prophet; the priest; the poet; the philosopher; the mystic give in classic form the record of a varied religious experience. One finds God in the flaming bush, one finds Him through the familiar symbols of worship—"high and lifted up—and His train filled the temple"; one is called from following after the flock; and another searches in the earthquake, wind and fire, but finds Him at last in the still, small voice. One struck the rock for the waters to come forth; another saw in his mind's eye a vision of the broad, peaceful river coming from the Temple to give healing to the land. The confident mood of the soul's security finds its

expression in the psalmist's exultant cry that God is his rock and his salvation. Discouragement cries out, "Have mercy upon me O God and blot out all my transgressions." All the range of temperamental difference is exhibited from the common sense practical morality of the good life that the Wisdom Literature exalts to the pure mysticism of the Fourth Gospel that finds it life eternal to know God himself. The whole range of belief is there evidenced in that slow development in thinking from Deborah's god of battles who called the stars in their courses to fight against Sisera, to the God of Jesus who is God and Father of all mankind and who knows more than an earthly father how to give good gifts to all his children. All differences in the activities that may express the religious life of man from Shamgar slaying the Philistines with an ox-goad to the great, organizing, constructive enterprise of Paul the apostle of Christianity. The whole gamut of human experience in the field of religion is here exhibited now on the lower level and now on the higher and as teaching material for the development of a fundamental respect for diversity of attitude and activity. I know no better field. And as we see finally in the figure of Jesus the balance of qualities which brings perfect harmony into one individual life we set before us the goal toward which all life must tend.

The first, then, of the attitudes which should be governing in our teaching experience is an attitude of complete respect for the differences in belief and practice which are the normal expression of psychological and environmental differences. But this leads us directly to the second. With full recognition of the differences which will appear in human attitudes and practices and with full respect for them, a unity of purpose can be steadily sought. Again for the producing and fostering of this attitude, I know no better teaching material than that which is directly at our hand. With all the conflicting notions that appear in the sweep of Biblical thought—differing ideas of cosmology, of the problem of health and disease, of sin and its punishment, of suffering and its meaning; of the possibility and nature of life after death; yes,

even of goodness itself, there is still a unity of purpose as clear as crystal. The search of man to realize the presence of God in human life is the *raison d'être* for all the writing that makes up this great note-book of religious experience. Today we also must search in different ways, use different methods, and different tools, but if this is not the fundamental quest of all life, in whose recognition is the only harmony worth striving for at all, then I know not where to look for the meaning of human life.

A year and a half ago I heard Professor J. Arthur Thomson speaking to a group of British students on the relation between science and religion, and with the fine simplicity of expression which characterizes his scientific writing he spoke to them of the three great permanent quests which he believes are expressed not merely in the human realm but in all animate life: Truth and the finding of it; beauty and the making of it; goodness and the doing of it. And are not these the great unifying pursuits which are to bring all diversity of mood, temperament and circumstance into harmony at last? And here in the three great quests are exercised the three aspects of man's conscious life—his reason in the search for truth, his emotion in the passion for beauty, and his activity in the pursuit of goodness. Viewed under the aspect of religion these three quests are focussed on God Himself. God who is Truth, God who is Beauty, and God who is Goodness. To this search for God—which is man's purposeful activity at its highest, it is ours to direct the thinking of our students. Dismissing all that is trivial, all that is of merely ephemeral interest, all that has only local significance, it is ours to demonstrate that this literary religious heritage is a record of that primal quest of mankind and this it is which constitutes its ultimate unity of purpose.

Through conscious direction of thinking, then, to these two fundamental attitudes underlying the literature which we handle, a respect for diversity of expression; a recognition of unity in purpose, we work toward a harmony that is rich and satisfying. Immediate corollaries of these positions suggest themselves as significant for the Biblical teacher: that

religion is primarily a matter of experience rather than of dogma; that revelation is not static but progressive; that inspiration is not mechanical but vital; and that creativity in both thought and action is the product of a disciplined freedom. But all roads lead in the direction of the third attitude toward which I wish to direct your thought. I believe that the harmony which results from the recognition of disparity in process, but of unity in purpose, is summed up and completely compassed in the respect for personality which is the very essence of Christianity itself. And by this I mean that the crux of our teaching must be the consideration of the message and personality of Jesus. The supreme significance of Jesus for this age lies just here, that he both lived and taught the infinite and eternal value of human personality. Until that lesson has become real in life, there can be no harmony in industry, no harmony between labor and capital; no harmony in international relations; no harmony in the church; and no harmony in religious thinking at large. The world talks loudly of a social gospel, but until this attitude becomes controlling the social enterprise has not even begun.

Henry Sedgwick in his winning appeal for the contemplative virtues "*Pro Vita Monastica*", says that the church has forgotten "that the business of Christianity is not merely to satisfy the spiritual needs that she finds, but also to deepen and broaden and heighten those that exist, and to create new needs as well." If the church has forgotten, is it not for the educators of today to bring to her remembrance her primary task? In the matter of harmony, she herself is today in direst need. If educators can work creatively to produce the true harmony which is not a vapid indulgence, but which still holds with it all the fire of intense devotion; which preserves a legitimate disparity in process at the same time that it works through fundamental unity of purpose, which is built on the respect for personality that is Christianity's distinctive gift to religious thinking, they will have given their high gift to this generation.

This consideration has dealt with the problem from the point of view of the educator, the one whose function it is to look the present situation squarely in the face and analyze its failures, and to look ahead also to formulate some ideals and policies by which our faulty present can be molded into a fairer and more worthy future. As we contemplate the sad discrepancy between our present religious situation and this goal which we desire, we can hardly fail to chafe impatiently at sitting peacefully here in this quiet room talking of harmony, while controversy and dissension are shaking this very city. We seem, as it were, to be lightly making music, while Rome is burning even as we talk. But as we transfer our thinking from this aspect of the situation—the educator and his ideal—to the other side, that of the college student of today, and his reaction to the situation, I confess to a real perplexity of mind. What we should expect from this college generation is bitterness and intolerance in the extreme. This student generation has had its childhood in one of the most confused and confusing periods that the world has ever known. The youth of today has had no fair chance for growing up. Our students have breathed the atmosphere of hatred and war from their childhood up. Animosities have been glorified and hatred has had the sanction of both patriotism and religion upon it.

But the result seems hardly what we should expect. Do the college students of today exhibit a passionate intensity of belief? Do they lay hold on this religious controversy which shakes the country, as if it mattered supremely to them which way the issue should lie? Are they the violent and aggressive champions of any religious view? What is actually the case is that the charge brought against youth today is not the charge of aggressiveness or animosity, but the charge of indifference. To my mind, a significant indictment of the women's colleges appeared in *The Nation* for November 21, under the caption "The Languid Generation." The writer comments on a conference held recently of editors and managers of undergraduate newspapers of Eastern women's colleges at which the delegates discussed the policies of their re-

spective college papers and acknowledged that their difficulty was, as the writer stated it, that "the students were not interested in anything." "They looked in vain," said the writer, "for any breath of hot feeling, some prejudice, some clash of ideas. All they found was a languid tolerance for any idea."

Allowing for some overstatement in the interests of good copy, if this charge is founded at all, may it not be a direct reaction from the over-zealous, intolerant championship of this, that, or the other idea, or cause, with which this present generation has been all too familiar and with which its patience is completely exhausted?

But whichever direction is taken by this student generation, whether they turn to follow their fathers into a too narrow partizanship, or whether in reaction from it, they fall back into a too languid indifference, I for one do not hesitate to assert that education today has no normal task. We shall not emerge from the present difficult situation without earnest effort and vigorous search to discover the right path. I do not see how we can predict with certainty which side of the ideal as stated will need the stress. We must be ready for either. I cannot feel that there is any short road to the kind of religious harmony which we have just been describing. The change must come through the slow, steady method of evolution, education for better ideas and ideals. And as I think of the whole scope of the educational process, I cannot but feel that our province of it lies closest to the heart of both the difficulty and its solution, and that the major part of the task is ours. This literature which we hold in our hands for consideration will, I prophesy, yield the most important results of any material in the whole field of education in building the true harmony of the future.

Katherine Mansfield, in one of those delightful bits of self-revelation that her journal has preserved for us and that the *Yale Review* has recently been publishing, exclaims: "Since I came here, I have been very interested in the Bible. I have read the Bible for hours on end. I feel so bitterly I should have known these writings. They ought to be part of my breathing." And this is the note on which I would leave this

discussion in your hands. We ought to make the spiritual values, for which the Bible stands, part of the very breathing of our students. Sanity, balance, the spacious tolerance which respects different attitudes, but which has not sacrificed one whit of zeal or fire in personal religion, will grow, I believe, as our students lay hold on these writings and make them part of the very fabric of their thinking.

We in our teaching are to be the ministers of this great gift. To interpret life through this medium is, as I see it, the greatest adventure that could lie before the teaching profession. As we see our age and its needs, as we try to glimpse the time when our students shall have become the leaders and the shapers of the destiny of American religious life, as we see the values for which the Bible stands and the influence that they are capable of exerting, I cannot but feel that each one of us should square his shoulders as he thinks of his task and say, "To have this chance is the most stirring challenge that life could bring. I will rejoice as a strong man to run a race."

The Biblical Teacher and Biblical Facts

PROFESSOR J. GRESHAM MACHEN, Princeton Theological Seminary

IN the sphere of education, facts are having a hard time. The old fashioned notion of reading a book or hearing a lecture and simply storing up in the mind what the book or the lecture contains—this is regarded as entirely out of date. The other day I heard a noted educator give some advice to a company of college professors. It is a great mistake, he said, to suppose that a college professor ought to teach; on the contrary he ought simply to give the students an opportunity to learn.

This pedagogic theory has been having its natural result; it has joined forces with the natural indolence of youth to produce in present-day education a very lamentable decline. The decline has not perhaps been universal; in the sphere of the physical sciences, for example, the acquisition of facts is not regarded as altogether out of date. But in the spheres of literature and history, and still more in that of language-

study, the tendency is perfectly plain. An outstanding feature of contemporary education in these departments is the growth of ignorance; pedagogic theory and the growth of ignorance have gone hand in hand. The undergraduate student is being told that he **need not take notes on what he hears in class**, that the exercise of the memory is a rather childish and mechanical thing, and that what he is really in college to do is to think for himself and to unify his world. He usually makes a poor business of unifying his world. And the reason is clear. He does not succeed in unifying his world for the simple reason that he has no world to unify. He has not acquired a knowledge of a sufficient number of facts in order even to learn the method of putting facts together. He is being told to practice the business of mental digestion; but the trouble is that he has no food to digest. The modern student, contrary to what is often said, is really being starved for want of facts.

But if that condition prevails in the sphere of general education it is tenfold worse in the sphere of the Christian religion and in the sphere of the Bible. Bible classes to-day often avoid a study of the contents of the Bible as they would avoid pestilence or disease. But surely that tendency should be resisted. It does seem to me—hopelessly out of date as it may be regarded—that the first function of the Biblical teacher is to impart a simple knowledge of what the Bible contains. Discussion may come later, but the first thing is to let the Bible—the whole Bible, not an expurgated Bible—the first thing is to let the Bible speak for itself.

A generation or so ago this notion of letting the Bible speak for itself, or at least letting the individual Biblical writers speak for themselves, was exalted to the dignity of a principle. The principle was called "grammatico-historical exegesis." The fundamental notion of it was that the modern student should distinguish sharply between what he would have said or what he would have liked to have the Biblical writer say, and what the writer actually did say. The latter question only was regarded as forming the subject-matter of exegesis.

This principle, in America, is rapidly being abandoned. It is not being abandoned in theory; lip-service is still being paid to it. But it is being abandoned in fact. It is being abandoned by the most eminent scholars. It is abandoned by Professor Goodspeed, for example, when in his translation of the New Testament he translates *dikaioo*, "justify," by "make upright." I confess that it is not without regret that I should see the doctrine of justification by faith, which is the foundation of evangelical liberty, thus removed from the New Testament; it is not without regret that I should abandon the whole of the Reformation and return with Professor Goodspeed to the merit-religion of the Middle Ages. But the point that I am now making is not that Professor Goodspeed's translation is unfortunate because it involves—as it certainly does—religious retrogression, but because it involves an abandonment of historical method in exegesis. It may well be that this question how a sinful man may become "right with God" does not interest the modern translator; but every true historian must certainly admit that it did interest the Apostle Paul. And the translator of Paul must, if he be true to his trust, place the emphasis where Paul placed it and not where the translator could have wished it placed.

What is true in the case of Paul is true also in the case of Jesus. Modern writers have abandoned the historical method of approach. They persist in confusing the question what they could have wished that Jesus had been with the question what Jesus actually was. In reading one of the most popular recent books on the subject of religion—*The Reconstruction of Religion* by Professor Ellwood—I came upon the following amazing assertion. "Jesus," the author says, "concerned himself but little with the question of existence after death!"⁽¹⁾ In the presence of such assertions any student of history may well stand aghast. It may be that we do not make much of the doctrine of a future life, but the question whether Jesus did so is not a matter of taste but an historical question which can be answered only on the basis of an examination of the

(1) Ellwood, *The Reconstruction of Religion*, 1922, p. 141.

POMONA COLLEGE
LIBRARY

DECEMBER, 1924

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

sources of historical information, which we call the Gospels. And the result of such examination is perfectly plain. As a matter of fact, not only the thought of heaven but also the thought of hell runs all through the teaching of Jesus. It appears in all four of the Gospels; it appears in the sources, supposed to underly the Gospels, which have been reconstructed, rightly or wrongly, by modern criticism. It imparts to the ethical teaching of Jesus its peculiar earnestness. It is not an element which can be removed by any critical process but simply suffuses the whole of Jesus' teaching and Jesus' life. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "It is good for thee to enter into life with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into the Gehenna of fire"—these words are not an excrescence in Jesus' teaching but are quite at the centre of the whole.

At any rate if you are going to remove the thought of a future life from the teaching of Jesus, if you are going to reject the *prima facie* evidence, you can do so only by a critical grounding of your procedure. And my point is that that critical grounding is now usually thought to be quite unnecessary. Modern American writers simply attribute their own predilections to Jesus without, apparently, the slightest scrutiny of the facts.

This wholesale abandonment of historical method is being summed up in the use of one word—the word "interpretation." Formerly when men had brought to their attention perfectly clear assertions they used to accept them or else deny them. Now they no longer deny, but merely "interpret." History, men say, must be interpreted in accordance with the thought of our own age. But I sometimes wonder just where this business of interpretation will stop. I am in a company of modern men. They begin to test my intelligence. And first they test me on the subject of mathematics. "What does six times nine make?" I am asked. I breathe a sigh of relief; many questions might have placed me very low in the scale of intelligence, but this question I think I can answer. I raise my hand hopefully. "I know that one," I say. "Six nines are

fifty-four." But my complacency is short-lived. My modern examiner puts on a grave look. "Where have you been living?" he says. "'Six nines are fifty-four'—that is the old answer to the question." In my ignorance I am somewhat surprised. "Why," I say, "everybody knows that; that stands in the multiplication-table; do you not accept the multiplication-table?" "Oh yes," says my modern friend, "of course I accept the multiplication-table. But then I do not take a static view of the multiplication-table; every generation must interpret the multiplication-table in its own way. And so of course I accept the proposition that six nines are fifty-four, but I interpret that to mean that six nines are a hundred and seventeen." And then the examination gets into the sphere of history. The examiner asks me where the Declaration of Independence was adopted. That one also I think I know. "The Declaration of Independence," I say, "was adopted at Philadelphia." But again I meet with a swift rebuke. "That is the old answer to the question," I am told. "But," I say, "everyone knows that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia; that stands in all the history books; do you not accept what stands in the history books?" "Oh yes," says my modern friend. "we accept everything that stands in the history books—hundred-per-cent Americans we are. But then, you see, we have to interpret the history books in our own way. And so of course we accept the proposition that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia, but we interpret that to mean that it was adopted at San Francisco." And then finally the examination turns to the history of the Christian religion. "What do you think happened," I am asked, "after Jesus was laid in that tomb near Jerusalem about nineteen hundred years ago." To that question also I have a very definite answer. "I will tell you what I think happened," I say: "He was laid in the tomb and then the third day He rose again from the dead." At this point the surprise of my modern friend reaches its height. The idea of a professor in a theological seminary actually believing that a dead man rose from the grave! "Everyone," the examiner tells me, "has abandoned that answer to the question

long ago." "But," I say, "my friend, this is very serious; that answer stands in the Apostles' Creed as well as at the center of the New Testament; do you not then accept the Apostles' Creed?" "Oh yes," says my modern friend, "of course I accept the Apostles' Creed; do we not say it every Sunday in church—or at least if we do not say it we sing it—of course I accept the Apostles' Creed. But then, do you not see, every generation has a right to interpret the Creed in its own way. And so now of course we accept the proposition that 'the third day He rose again from the dead'; but we interpret that to mean, 'The third day He did not rise again from the dead'."

In view of this modern art of interpretation one may almost wonder whether the lofty human gift of speech has not been rendered entirely useless. If everything that I say can be interpreted to mean its exact opposite, what is the use of saying anything at all? I do not know when the great revival of religion will come. But one thing is perfectly clear. When it does come, the whole elaborate art of "interpretation" will be brushed aside, and there will be a return, as there was at the Reformation of the sixteenth century, to plain common sense and common honesty. It is a very great mistake to suppose that as Biblical teachers you "have a right" to interpret the Bible as you please. Certainly if your interpretation differs from mine I have no right to force you, by physical compulsion, to hold my view. But as for you, in the presence of God, the only interpretation which you have a right to hold is the interpretation which is true—not an interpretation which changes from generation to generation but the interpretation which was held by the original author of the books.

The widespread abandonment of historical interest in dealing with the Bible is not without importance. At bottom it involves nothing less than an abandonment of the Christian religion. For the Christian religion differs from other religions just in being founded, not merely upon permanent truths, but upon events. If certain things happened in the first century of our era, as they are said to have happened in the New Testament, then the Christian religion is true; if they did not happen, then the Christian religion is false, and some totally

different religion, such as the naturalistic Modernism of the present day, which is essentially the same, I suppose, as the religion of humanity of the Positivists and of Professor Ellwood, must be substituted for it. Or else—an alternative which I personally might be obliged to prefer—we shall have to get along without any religion at all.

But is the Christian religion really founded upon events? That question involves a question which has actually gotten into the magazines and the front pages of the newspapers—the question, "What is Christianity?" (1)

How shall that question be answered? I for my part believe that it can be answered only by an examination of the thing that is to be defined. I am actually old-fashioned enough to think that if you are going to tell what Christianity is the proper thing to do is to look at Christianity. If I were asked to give a description of the City of New York I should not go into the centre of Kansas and evolve a description of New York out of my inner consciousness, but I should take a train to this city and having looked the place over I should try to tell what it is like. So it is with Christianity. Christianity is an historical phenomenon like the city of New York or the United States of America or the Kingdom of Prussia or the Roman Empire. And being an historical phenomenon it can be investigated only by historical means. When you say that Christianity is this or that you are making an assertion in the sphere of history; it is very different from saying that Christianity ought to be this or that, or that Christianity would have been better if it had been this or that, or that the ideal religion would be this or that. The question "What is Christianity?" does not lie in the sphere of ideals; it is not a question about what ought to be, but a question about what is. And as such it must be investigated by historical means.

But how shall we determine what any great movement in its essence really is? I do not see how you can avoid going back to the beginnings of the movement. Unless there is some

(1) For what follows, compare *Christianity and Liberalism*, 1923, especially pp. 19 ff.

sort of continuity between the later manifestations and the beginning, the use of the original name is obviously misleading. So it is with Christianity. It is quite conceivable that the originators of the Christian religion, whoever they were, were mistaken—that is a matter for investigation. It is quite conceivable that they had no right to legislate for all subsequent generations. But at any rate they did have the right to legislate for all generations that should choose to bear the name of "Christian." We can determine what Christianity is only by examining the beginnings of Christianity.

And when the examination is carried on without prejudice, the result of it is plain enough. Clearly Christianity at its inception was not just a way of life, but a way of life founded upon a message. If one thing is abundantly plain it is that the first Christian missionaries did not just come forward and say, "We have been living in contact with a wonderful person, Jesus of Nazareth, and we call upon you our hearers to submit yourselves to the contagion of that great personality." That is what modern men might have expected the first Christian missionaries to say. But as a matter of cold historical fact it is perfectly plain that they said nothing of the kind. What they did say was, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; He was buried; He has been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Christianity at its inception was certainly a strange new type of life; but it was a type of life founded not upon mere exhortation or upon the contagion of personal relationship, but upon a piece of news; it was not a life as distinguished from a doctrine, but a life founded upon a doctrine.

But, men say, although all that holds good for the earliest apostolic preaching, may we not now have recourse from the apostles to Jesus Himself; may we not substitute the gospel of Jesus for the gospel about Jesus, the gospel which Jesus proclaimed for the gospel in which He was proclaimed? The proposal of course dethrones Jesus from His position in the human heart. Those who accept a gospel of Jesus stand in a far less intimate relation to Jesus than those who accept a gospel about Jesus; they have Jesus as an example and teacher,

whereas those who accept a gospel about Jesus have Jesus as a Saviour. But what was that gospel of Jesus, that gospel which Jesus proclaimed? In the New Testament it is represented as being at its centre also a gospel about Jesus; Jesus is represented in offering Himself not merely as an example for faith but as the object of faith. And He began His preaching in Galilee by the words, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Jesus according to the Gospels certainly did proclaim an event; He proclaimed the catastrophic coming of the Kingdom of God. All modern efforts to eliminate this element in His teaching have failed. During the earthly ministry of Jesus the event was in the future; in the Apostolic Age the first great act of it was already in the past, but Jesus like the Apostles did proclaim an event. Jesus came, as has well been said, not primarily to say something, but to do something. And all Christianity is based upon the recognition of that fact. Christianity, in other words, is not a philosophy but a redemptive religion; it is founded not merely upon what always existed but upon what happened, not merely upon eternal truths but upon historical facts.

There is one advantage about facts—they stay put. All knowledge is based upon a static view of facts—the knowledge involved in the physical sciences and also the knowledge involved in the Christian religion. When I was very young I used to ask myself whether God could make a thing that had happened so that it had not happened. The question no longer troubles me. Possibly God could do it, but I am quite sure that He never will. A fact remains a fact for millions upon millions of years, and it remains a fact not only here but on the remotest star.

But modern Biblical study is increasingly indifferent to facts. "It makes no difference" is its great slogan where historical questions are concerned. The result is a lamentable intellectual decline. In the evil days upon which Biblical scholarship has now fallen one can almost long even for the errors of the past. The Hegelianism of Baur and his associates was no doubt a serious error; but unlike modern pragmatism it was not an error that discouraged intellectual life.

Many of you no doubt disagree with me about the facts of Biblical history—about the Virgin Birth of Jesus, His miracles, His resurrection. I certainly cannot hope to convince you, in the half-hour which is now, at an end, that I am right and you are wrong. But let us be clear about one point—these things are not matter of indifference. It is upon these questions that the future of the Christian religion depends. The Christian religion is not independent of science—scientific history or the physical science—it is not a harmless and useless epiphenomenon without interrelation with other spheres of knowledge, but like everything else that is worth while it must seek to justify its place, despite all the conflicts which that involves, in the realm of facts.

Recent Lives of Christ

DIRECTOR ELBERT RUSSELL, Woolman School

IT is not in lives of Christ of the conventional type that we look for the newest work on the life of Christ. The material is not at hand for any essentially new presentation of it. Dr. Cadbury calls my attention to the fact that the best scholarly work on the subject is being put forth in monographs. Of the five books put out during 1922 and 1923, which I have chosen for special notice, only one calls itself a biography of Jesus. The others are dominated largely by literary, social, or apologetic aims.

The works chosen after an examination of the material of the last two years—necessarily reading much of it by title and some by proxy—are the following: Irvine, "The Carpenter and His Kingdom"; Barton, "Jesus of Nazareth"; Headlam, "The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ"; Papini, "Life of Christ"; and Dougall and Emmet, "The Lord of Thought."

Irvine's work is not a conventional treatment of Jesus' life. He has no critical discussion of sources or of theological problems. He devotes a single chapter to the influences of Jesus' youth. He has not attempted to arrange the several recorded events in chronological order or deal with all that

are recorded. It is marred by some misquotations and by poor proof-reading. It is chiefly devoted to the social teaching of Jesus. It is vigorously anti-ecclesiastical, socially radical and pacifist. It reminds one of Bouck White's "The Call of the Carpenter," but is not so pungent in style or so able in presentation. Its chief significance lies in the wholehearted appreciation and acceptance of Jesus by a man from the ranks of labor. Such a combination of religious and literary interest with the cause of labor, while common in England, is rare in America.

Dr. Barton's book is written ostensibly for young people, but it might better be called a popular life of Christ. It is a constructive product of critical scholarship—a work written by a scholar for those who are not scholars. The writer aims at a fair presentation of both sides of disputed questions, distinguishes and evaluates sources, presenting the Johannine material but keeping it separate from the Synoptic sources. The work is, on the whole, less radical than one might expect from the author and its impression is constructive and reverent.

Dr. Headlam sets himself the task of defending the historicity of the traditional, i. e., the gospel representation of Jesus as against the comparatively small groups in Europe and America who hold that Jesus is a myth or who deny that there is any appreciable historical value to the gospel records. His work is incomplete, since he carries it only as far as the transfiguration. The author hopes in another volume to complete the study. He makes a study of the sources, the historical background and teaching of Jesus, and endeavors to show that the gospel account of both life and teaching is so thoroughly consonant with the known facts as to exclude the possibility that a myth maker of a later age produced them. The book displays the apologetic resources which historical criticism has put at the disposal of faith since Strauss' "Life of Jesus" made it gasp with inarticulate horror.

Papini's "Life" is perhaps the most notable. He accepts the gospels quite uncritically and adds to them certain Catholic traditions. In fact the book suggests at times a series of

essays on Tissot's illustrations of the Life of Jesus. As might be expected of a Latin, he makes too much of symbolism and sentiment to suit our Anglo-Saxon taste. The book abounds in surprising interpretations of character and motives, and in brilliant descriptions of scenes. The writer has studied the gospels deeply and is thoroughly conversant with the historical conditions under which Jesus lived, for all his professed scorn of scholarship. He shows himself a lover of poor people, with sympathetic insight into their feelings and thoughts as, for example, in his description of the synagog congregation in Capernaum. He takes the social teachings of Jesus very literally and is almost ascetic in his attitude to property. Money he hates with almost monastic abhorrence. But he does not share the ascetic attitude toward family life. He has a beautiful passage on the feeling of a father, when he holds his child in his arms. His account of the feelings of the propertied and privileged classes in Jerusalem toward Jesus, when his influence threatened to change the religion that sustained them, is a masterly study in social motives.

The thesis of Dougall and Emmet's work,—which is not properly a life of Jesus at all and is wholly occupied with certain phases of his recorded teaching,—is that the apocalyptic and eschatological elements in the gospels are importations—more or less unconscious—from Judaism. They find Jesus' real teaching in the ethical and religious aspects of the parables, the Sermon on the Mount, and similar passages. They find the apocalyptic literature (Enoch, Baruch, 4 Esdras, Jubilees, etc.), filled with a spirit of national exclusiveness and vengeance, camouflaged as judgment and justice. Since Jesus repudiated this spirit, substituting for it a spirit of forgiveness to oppressors and of world-wide brotherhood, the authors hold that he must have repudiated the whole system of thought. They have not, it seems to me, sufficiently considered a third alternative, that he may have kept the eschatological language but spiritualized its contents, as he did the terms Christ and Kingdom of God. The critical processes by which Emmet justifies the positions taken suggest at times a rather dogmatic determination to reach a foregone conclusion.

Certain general considerations present themselves from an examination of these works.

Three of the five writers are men who have recently been on a religious quest. Someone has said that the Catholics and the Quakers were the two religious denominations which came out of the war without loss of prestige. Irvine has recently joined the Society of Friends after a remarkable experience as laborer, missionary, unionist, and scholar. Papini in middle life has turned from his rationalist and radical ways to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Dr. Barton in the stress of the war renounced the pacifism of the Society of Friends, of which he had been a life-long member, and joined the Episcopal Church.

Most of these authors show the new consciousness of Jesus' organic relation to the contemporary social and political life, not only of Judaism but of the Roman empire. Simkhovitch has recently restated this forcibly and Findlay cannot write a commentary even on the Sermon on the Mount (The Realism of Jesus) without one chapter on the Empire and four on the Jewish world. The older writers presented the historic setting rather as a background against which to show by contrast Jesus' uniqueness. They put new emphasis on the teaching of Jesus in its social and ethical rather than its theological aspects. This is especially true of Irvine, Papini, and in a different way of Dougall and Emmet. They are conscious of the contrast (as was Tolstoi) between the principles of Jesus and the "baptized paganism" of much of our historic social and political ethics; and between the this-worldly interest of Jesus and the other-worldiness of both monasticism and millennialism.

There is apparent a new disposition to take the Sermon on the Mount at its face value and give it the importance its place in Jesus' teaching demands. This is especially true—and surprising—in Papini, who gives about 40 pages out of 400 to a detailed exposition of the Sermon in its apparent socialistic and pacifist sense. Only Headlam and Barton feel fearful that the attempt to practise it at once might lead to

dire economic and international results. The others feel that only by following the way of life here pointed out can men and nations escape the present dire situation and find in His narrow way the way of salvation for the world.

Here and There

SALARIES OF THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS

A STUDY of the salary lists of eight of the leading and best equipped theological seminaries of the United States shows that two pay a minimum salary of \$8,000 for the full professorship. The minimum salary for professors on full time ranges from \$2,500 to \$6,000, the prevailing salary being from \$4,000 to \$5,000. The associate professors receive from \$3,500 to \$6,000, the assistant professors from \$2,700 to \$4,500, and the instructors on full time from \$1,500 to \$3,500. Some of the salary schedules have not been changed for many years.

* * * * *

The Revell Company, New York, has recently brought out a remarkable little book entitled "The Influence of the Bible on History, Literature and Oratory," by the Reverend Thomas Tiplady. The author shows the influence of the Bible on the style and character of England's long succession of poets, essayists and novelists; and turning to the great ages of national power he shows that the great nations have always been the Bible nations and that national awakening or rejuvenation has always followed upon a revival of Bible reading. He shows how the publication of Erasmus' New Testament began the Reformation, how the character of the people was transformed during the closing years of Queen Elizabeth and the generation succeeding, when as Greene tells us "a new moral and religious impulse spread through every class. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible." His study of biography convinces him that the read-

ing of the Bible produced great personalities and power. When the great experiences and great thoughts found there were translated into drama we got Hamlet, Macbeth, Paradise Lost and Pilgrim's Progress. He doubts very much if a nation reared on daily papers will produce Miltons, Shakespeares, Cromwells, Bunyans, Spensers, Raleighs, as a nation reared on the Bible did.

* * * * *

According to the Annual Report of the Executive Committee of Christian Education and Ministerial Relief of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, May, 1924, of which Dr. H. H. Sweets is Executive Secretary, this Church has ninety-five educational institutions in active operation with almost 1,000 faculty members and almost 14,000 students. The value of the property of these institutions is sixteen and one-half million dollars and the value of their endowment over eight millions.

* * * * *

In one of the recent annual reports reaching the office of the Council, it is stated that the average endowment per student of nine independent institutions—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Amherst, Williams, Dartmouth, Vanderbilt, Leland Stanford, Jr.—amounts to \$8,050.

*Copy -
Mr. Amey
Barnard
Baker
Blair*

Transportation Announcement

Annual Meeting Association of American Colleges

If 250 tickets to Chicago are sold to members of the Association and their families attending the meeting of the Association of American Colleges to be held at the Hotel Morrison, Chicago, Ill., January 8-10, 1925, the reduced rate of one and one-half fare on the "Certificate Plan" will apply. The arrangement will cover the following territory:

Central Passenger Association,
Western Passenger Association,
Transcontinental Passenger Association,
South-western Passenger Association,
South-eastern Passenger Association,
New England Passenger Association,
Trunk Line Association.

The following directions are submitted by the railroads for your guidance:

1. Tickets at the regular one-way tariff fare for the going journey may be obtained on any of the following dates, January 5-10, 1925, or earlier from distant points. Be sure that, when purchasing your going ticket, you request a CERTIFICATE. *Do not make the mistake of asking for a "receipt."*

2. *Certificates are not kept at all stations.* If you inquire at your home station, you can ascertain whether certificates and through tickets can be obtained to place of meeting. If not obtainable at your home station, the agent will inform you at what station they can be obtained. You can in such case purchase a local ticket to the station which has certificates in stock, where you can purchase a through ticket and at the same time ask for and obtain a *certificate* to the place of meeting.

3. Immediately on your arrival at the meeting, present your certificate to the endorsing officer, Mr. Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary, as the reduced fare for the return journey will not apply unless you are properly identified as provided for by the certificate.

4. Arrangements have been made for validation of certificates by a Special Agent of the carriers on January 8-10, if the required minimum of 250 certificates is presented.

5. *No refund of fare will be made on account of failure to either obtain a proper certificate nor on account of failure to have the certificate validated.*

6. So as to prevent disappointment, it must be understood that the reduction on the return journey is not guaranteed, but is contingent on an attendance

of not less than 250 members of the organization and dependent members of their families, holding regularly issued certificates obtained from ticket agents at starting points.

7. If the necessary minimum of 250 certificates is presented to the Special Agent as above explained, and your certificate is duly validated, you will be entitled up to and including January 14, 1925, to a return ticket via the same route over which you made the going journey, at one-half of the regular one-way tariff fare from the place of the meeting to the point at which your certificate was issued.

8. Return ticket issued at the reduced fare will not be good on any limited train on which such reduced fare transportation is not honored.

